

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume IV, No. 5

APRIL 3, 1944

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Is the Bombing Necessary?

THE protest of leading pacifists against the destruction of German cities by bombing must remain unconvincing to those who do not share their conviction that this war was unnecessary and that victory over Nazism is not a prerequisite of a tolerable world order. The protest, which has received such wide publicity, was originally published as a foreword to an article by the well known British pacifist, Vera Britain, in *Fellowship*, the organ of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Mr. Nevin Sayre added a postscript to the article in which he clearly reveals the integral relation between the pacifist presuppositions and the protest. Mr. Sayre declares: "The only right alternative to the mass murders that go with the blockade, bombing and invasion of a continent is to make an undictated and creative peace upon the basis of equality of all peoples." This means of course that the whole war is rejected as well as the bombing; and that pacifism is still involved in the illusion of the possibility of a negotiated peace with the present German government as party to the negotiations.

It is important furthermore to challenge the simple contrast made in the pacifist statement between human values and military necessity. For human values are also involved in a speedy and certain victory; for an avoidable prolongation of the German occupation of Europe would bring additional misery and death to millions.

The pacifist protest against bombing is thus clearly involved in the whole pacifist approach to historic tasks and reveals its inability to understand the tragic necessities of history. While we are thus forced to disavow such a protest we are also left uneasy by most of the criticisms which have been made of the protest because these criticisms emphasize the necessity of the bombing without recognition of the tragic character of the necessity. An adequate Christian statement must be informed by a consciousness of both the tragic and the necessary character of these choices.

Beyond these questions of basic principle the Christian churches might well direct two specific questions to our government in regard to the present bombing policy:

1. The first concerns the actual necessity of "area" or obliteration bombing. Some time ago the military authorities prided themselves upon the effectiveness of "precision" bombing, which singled out the industrial and transportation centers of the enemy. Since then the policy seems to have been changed to one of indiscriminate bombing of whole areas. The government has never thought it necessary to explain or justify this change of strategy. Do we not have a right to know what reasons prompted this change? It could certainly not be justified as reprisal for Rotterdam and Warsaw. Nor could the theory that the bombing of workers' homes represents an indirect destruction of industrial power justify it. Laymen are not capable of judging detailed problems of strategy, but general principles of strategy ought to remain under democratic scrutiny. This is the more necessary because the military mind is inclined to disregard moral and political factors in strategy and it is therefore unsafe to give it a final moral and political authority in matters of this kind.

2. An even more important question has been raised by a secular journalist, Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, in the columns of the *New York Times*. The question implies a criticism of war policy with which the churches ought to associate themselves. The question is whether we can justify "obliteration" bombing as a method of shortening the war unless "every other means of shortening the war" is tried at the same time. We have cause to be uneasy about the fact that our war strategy seems forced to place such great emphasis upon the physical destruction of the enemy, partly because we have no effective policy of political warfare.

Our policy of "unconditional surrender" and our lack of any positive program for the reconstruction of Europe which would include minimal security and stability for the defeated nations, has armed our enemies with the morale of pure despair, and has forced even the most vigorous anti-Nazis among the Germans to support the final effort to avoid defeat. The fact that German morale has improved in the last six months (a fact attested by reliable observers) is an indictment of the shallowness of our political policy. By emptying our cause of positive moral

meaning we have not only cast doubts upon the character of the peace but have also made our victory more difficult. To give no assurances about the future, except Mr. Churchill's guarantee that we will refrain from "barbarity," is to create a situation in which physical destruction becomes the only weapon in our hands.

It is not possible to escape the consequences of "total" war as they have been forced upon us by the character of a technical civilization. It is the more important therefore to shun the kind of totalitarianism which relies increasingly upon the purely physical instruments of victory, because it has lost the moral and spiritual content of its cause.

Editorial Notes

The profoundest poetic interpretation of the relation of the Christian faith to the world catastrophe has just been published. It is a poem entitled "The Crucifixion" by Mary Britton Miller, (Scribners). Here is a moving and searching analysis of the relation of The Cross to the terrible realities of war, which reveals more clearly than most sermons, why it is equally impossible to pass some simple judgment upon the bombing of cities or to condone the bombing with an easy conscience.

When Christ is taunted by Lucifer for inciting men to go to war,

"Christ replied
'I come to reap
The fields you sow.
The world is dark,
Ah, darker far,
Then when I hung
At Golgotha
Two thousand years ago.'"

The poem, about the length of a sermon, might well be read in many a holy week service.

Walter Clay Lowdermilk, a noted soil conservationist expert of the United States government, has just written a book entitled *Palestine, Land of Promise* in which he proposes a "Jordan Valley Authority" similar to our TVA for the reconstruction of soil productivity in Palestine. It is the most convincing and constructive book on the Palestinian problem which has come to our attention.

Incidentally Christians who do not believe that the "White Paper" restriction on immigration to Palestine should be abrogated, as advocated by a pending senatorial resolution, ought to feel obligated to state a workable alternative. The homeless

Jews must find a home; and Christians owe their Jewish brethren something more than verbal sympathy as they face the most tragic plight which has ever faced a people. The fact that General Marshall has intervened in the debate about immigration to Palestine, because in his belief senatorial action might interfere with the strategy of oil pipe lines to Arabia, raises an issue which we may expect to confront again and again in coming years. To what degree shall problems of political justice be subordinated to necessities of military strategy?

The Russian recognition of the Badoglio government reveals how much confusion is caused by those who regard Russia as a fixed standard of virtue in international relations. Our support of Badoglio has been questionable, primarily because it has discouraged the democratic forces in Italy. It continues to be questionable for that reason, despite Russia's recognition. This remains true even though no post-war stability is possible without a basic agreement with Russia. Such an agreement is possible only if the Western democracies have a clear democratic line on the continent which restores their prestige and does not place them at the mercy of Russian prestige, which Russia exploits again and again in purely power-political terms.

The *Holy Name Journal*, organ of the Holy Name Society, carries an hysterical attack upon this journal in its March issue. We are spoken of as "a poisonous little journal" which follows the line of the Third International. The reason for the attack is Bishop Parsons' recent measured editorial on the problem of Catholicism in politics and our editorial policy of advocating an accord with Russia. The various members of the editorial board are maligned in the most ludicrous manner. The president of Princeton Theological Seminary is identified as an "internationally known agitator who has preached in Spain, Peru and Mexico." Bishop Parsons' membership in the American Civil Liberties Union is regarded as tantamount to the profession of communism and Howard Chandler Robbins is admonished not to lend his name to a magazine which is "designed to further no cause of God but rather to wage ceaseless war upon the very Church founded by the Son of God."

The inevitable debate between Protestantism and Catholicism ought really to be maintained on a higher level than this kind of gutter journalism. No preaching of "goodwill" between Catholics and Protestants will avail very much if Catholics insist on identifying Protestant criticism with communism.

Notes on European Post-War Economic Problems

FREDERICK POLLOCK

UP to now, most public discussions of the fate of Europe have been concerned with such questions as the Polish borders, the proposed partitioning of Germany, and the Russian stand against a United States of Europe. But, it seems to me, that what is at stake is more fundamental than issues of national sovereignty, boundaries and federations. It is the economic organization of the continent west of Russia, the means of providing immediate employment and the prospect of a rising standard of living for the bulk of its population of 300 million.

From this viewpoint, the political problem is largely one of determining whether a political order enabling these economic needs to be realized can and will be established. Obviously, in many cases there will be a conflict between what is politically deemed to be mandatory and what is economically desirable. The greatest difficulty will arise from the fact that large-scale heavy industry and a high development of the production of substitutes for raw materials can be used by a potential aggressor for speedy rearmament. Another serious problem stems from the advantageous position Germany holds geographically and in respect to the industrial development of nearly all other European states. Compromises will necessarily be dictated by the demands of military security. We believe, however, that the best guarantee for security against future aggression and a situation leading to a third world war, is not so much mechanical pressure from without, to be exerted by a not too firm post-war alliance, but the creation of social and economic conditions within, that eliminate or at least weaken the forces making for international conflagrations.

What are the *economic problems* that will have to be faced? To mention some of the more crucial ones: with the collapse of the Nazi regime all currencies in Germany and German occupied countries will become worthless. It will become apparent that most savings and bank deposits as well as most of the banking capital has been wiped out. Industry in these countries will have lost a great part of its capital equipment; in the plants serving the war much equipment will be worn out or useless for civilian production. Raw materials and foodstuffs for Europe as a whole will be at a starvation level. According to the most reliable estimate, about twenty million people will have to be repatriated. Among the hundred million people living in South Eastern and Eastern Europe there exists today an agrarian surplus population overcrowding

the farms of perhaps twenty-five million. A substantial part of European industry forms today an interdependent structure with the control levers in Germany. For reconstruction, continental Europe will have a great need for imports from the Western hemisphere and little or no means of paying for them. The rehabilitation of European economy with modern machinery creates the nightmare of equipping a competitor of English and American industry on the world market, who might combine modern technical efficiency with very low wages and therefore sell at disastrous prices.¹

Some of the economic problems cited are apparently of a transitory character. The experience of the last war period shows, however, that even transitory economic difficulties that follow in the wake of the war do not solve themselves and may indeed develop into chronic diseases. A report of the League of Nations² stresses that "if (in 1918) a plan had been elaborated for the provision of stricken areas, not simply with what they required to eat but with what they required in order to be able to feed and clothe themselves, it would have contributed greatly to economic and social stability. . . ." But there was no understanding and no plan. What was finally done was done piece-meal, "too little and too late"—and most costly in terms of human sacrifice, waste, actual expenditure and the final outcome: the second world war. The "improvised system" of granting ill-conceived loans broke down in the great depression, responsibility for which the authors of the Report place squarely on the shoulders of the peacemakers. The sufferings of the hundred million people who through no fault of their own found themselves unable to earn a livelihood, and the incalculable moral and psychological cost of such a profound dislocation of social life, are a warning of what might happen if the Allies fail once more to come to grips with the even more complicated economic tasks that will arise after this war.

In fact, the very magnitude of these tasks makes it obvious that we cannot count on any one ready-made panacea. Currency arrangements, investment banks, cartel agreements, all on an international scale, might be necessary tools, but their efficacy

¹ On a small scale, Allied policy has already been faced with this dilemma: recently, requests for badly needed textile machinery for factories in Southern Italy and new equipment for Sicilian sulphur mines were turned down.

² The Transition from War to Peace, Geneva, 1943, p. 70.

will depend mainly on their integration into a workable economic system.

What choice is offered in deciding on such an economic system? I propose to submit all schemes to a set of elementary—though essential—questions, and to reject all those that fail to give a satisfactory reply. There are only a very limited number of economic alternatives for creating a stable and peaceful Europe, but an intensive study of these alternatives might help stop quibblings over unessentials and concentrate on the more decisive issues.

Our “test” questions are grouped around certain functions which must be fulfilled in every society whose economic life depends upon division of labor and large-scale production.

(1) Somebody, individuals or groups, must decide on maintenance, expansion or contraction of production and investment. *Who* makes the decisions? Individual capitalists in the meaning of owners of capital? A cartel bureaucracy? The government?

(2) Somehow the work of individual economic units must be coordinated and distributed. *How* is this to be done? By the “market-automatism” or by a planning authority?

(3) The economic objectives necessarily affect both the nature of the ruling agency and the economic mechanism itself—the “who” and the “how” of questions (1) and (2). *What*, then, are the economic incentives? For what is the economic system being run? Is it for profit or preparation for war or for some kind of general welfare?

(4) For the execution of a specific program, a minimum quantity of “factors” of production must be made available. Where does the necessary supply of labor, raw materials, and machinery come from? Are the national resources reasonably adequate or does the particular political unit require deliveries from outside? Is the dependence upon imports very serious as in the case of the British Isles or comparatively insignificant as in this country?

(5) What political conditions, domestic and international, are prerequisites of a specific economic set-up, and which ones may emanate from it? Does any of the possible political combinations comply with the given international order or does it depend on breaking up this order? Are they compatible with political freedom and international cooperation or do they involve domestic servitude and external aggression?

Abstract as these questions may appear to be, they, nevertheless, prompt answers which may be classified under four types of economic alternatives theoretically available today. To be sure, none of these types are to be found in a pure form in any of

the actual schemes of post-war planners; but they do represent, I think, the main tendencies of all our post-war economic visions. In briefly stating them, my intention is not to say the last word on the problem, but to indicate a method of approach.³

To illustrate this approach we might examine first a familiar economic type which today has only historical significance: *laissez-faire* economy. In a genuine *laissez-faire* economy, production and distribution are “directed” by the owners of the means of production (the “capitalists”), though none of them is powerful enough to dominate an entire industry. Its means of *coordination* is the “automatism” of the market whose price signals must be obeyed if the system is to work. Its disproportions are bound to grow as it expands but it manages to reach some sort of day-by-day equilibrium, periodically interrupted by more violent processes of adjustment. Its programmatic *goal* is ever greater production but nobody is responsible for this goal unless it coincides with the individual’s own striving for increased profit. The theory underlying *laissez-faire* is based on two fallacies: (1) that in domestic economic life “private vices turn into public benefits” (Mandeville), and (2) that in foreign trade the natural distribution of regional advantages in production guarantees a mutually beneficial and rising international exchange of goods and services.⁴

Today it has become apparent that the *laissez-faire* system could operate successfully at home only while the economic units and their productivity were comparatively small, and in the international field only so long as there existed a wide gap between one or more industrialized countries and the rest of the world. Despite all the lip service to the blessings of the nineteenth century economy, it seems to be generally accepted outside the United States that a return to the past does not belong to the economic post-war alternatives for Europe.

What, then, are our basic alternatives? From a purely economic point of view and disregarding their political feasibility, I can see only four basic types which give some promise of functioning, at least for a time.

The Four Alternative Answers

Type A. The type of economic structure envisaged here was characteristic of the great industrial countries before the rise of National Socialism; we

³ Necessarily, such detailed economic questions as saving and investment, bi-lateral or multi-lateral trade, exchange stabilization, etc. are omitted from this discussion. But they are obviously of secondary importance and can be considered profitably only after the major economic questions have been decided.

⁴ Ricardo’s contention that it is more advantageous for England to exchange hats made in England for wine made in Portugal than to cultivate grapes in the British Isles is, in this one instance, convincing; but its generalization is fallacious.

might thus call it the *status quo* type. It represents a mixture of liberal institutions with new features of control which, though stemming from the tendencies inherent in nineteenth century capitalism, are, nevertheless, incompatible with its basic principles. In the field of the *decision* on production and investment, we find side by side with the old style capitalists the modern managers, many of whom are virtually independent of the owners of capital. Furthermore, those few who control the large enterprises acquire far greater economic power than the great majority of small owners whose capital would have been adequate in a liberal economy, but who have been dwarfed by the growth of modern giant enterprises.

Here, monopolistic powers, against which the well meant efforts of the Anti-Trust Division look somewhat quixotic, operate in a supposedly free market. But they are unwilling to obey the market signals and are strong enough to keep up their prices with little regard for changes in the demand-supply situation. European and American experiences have amply shown that manipulation of prices by all kinds of monopolies threw the burden of coordination onto those weaker groups which still operated under the system of free prices, thus nullifying in effect the coordinating forces of the market. This trend, along with the disequilibrium of savings and investment that accompanied economic growth ultimately led to the great depression which, as we know, was finally overcome only by rearmament and war. Such a result should scarcely surprise us, for in this type of economy the vital function of *coordinating* the economic process is fulfilled by nobody, neither by the anonymous market forces nor by a planning authority. Under this system, some government intervention is unavoidable, and it is able to prevent utter catastrophe. But so long as it does not actively regulate the entire economy, the government can merely cure sporadic symptoms. Total planning from above goes beyond the limits of a *status quo* economy. It is characteristic of the other types we shall discuss.

The *aims* of the economic subjects under the *status quo* system are no longer profits alone. While profits still play an important role, other goals, such as maintenance or increase of economic power or the protection of existing capital at the expense of the vital entrepreneurial function of risk-taking, occupy the foreground. In addition, the profit motive as the main spring of the economy is further weakened by the enormous rise in taxation inevitable in this type of economic set-up.

Type B. The failure of the *status quo* type has led in Germany, and may lead in other countries to the establishing of an economic and political organization which is generally called fascism but which might be tentatively called "totalitarian collectivism

of the power type." Under such a system all *decisions* about production, investment, foreign trade, etc. are made by a coalition of those who control big business (owners as well as managers) and the top layers of those bureaucrats who hold the real power in the machinery of the government, the ruling party and the military. The *coordination* of the economic units is achieved by some kind of planning from above, which uses as much as possible of the traditional monopolistic organizations of business and labor. Whatever may have been left of autonomous market forces in the preceding "*status quo*" type, is being abolished. Entrepreneurial initiative is encouraged to achieve the highest productivity but always subordinated to the general plan. The profit motive is used consciously by the planning authorities, but it is no longer the guiding principle for the scope of production and investment. The *aim* of the ruling group is simply power—ever more power. In Germany this system has been tried out for building up an enormous war machine in a very short time on a comparatively very small "capital" basis. This was possible because no limitations other than the availability of raw materials, machinery and labor were admitted in the execution of the "plan." There is no valid reason why such a system should not function in peacetime without recourse to spending two thirds of the national product on armaments, if enough raw materials, machinery and labor could be made available. It could guarantee full employment and even a somewhat rising standard of living for a long time, but only at the expense of all individual liberty and by concentrating on continuous expansion which would not stop short of world conquest.

Type C. The discussions of the post-war economic order which have been going on in England during the last years have brought to the fore another economic alternative which we might call "totalitarian collectivism of the 'welfare' type." Such an economy would be *controlled* by an "elite" composed of the "enlightened" representatives of the ruling groups and the top bureaucrats of government and labor. Their *aim* would be the maintenance of the existing social order at the price of guaranteeing reasonably full employment, social welfare along the lines of the Beveridge plan, and a rising standard of living with better educational opportunities. These aims would be realized by public ownership or at least public control of all key industries, compulsory cartelization, "Public Industrial Boards," all operating under some kind of *planning* authority. Only minor economic activities would be left to private enterprise in the old sense, and even these would be subject to governmental investment control. The patently totalitarian character of such a collective economy is usually not admitted by the English "planners," and is assumed that all the regulative institutions

would work under the direction of a democratically elected parliament. However, in examining the ideas of writers like Edward Hallett Carr⁵, one must draw the conclusion that this system would be much more totalitarian than democratic in the traditional sense.

Type D. Theoretically, a collective economy can be directed by democratically chosen organs instead of by "enlightened" absolutists as in the preceding Type C. Should that be the case, we would have to speak of "democratic collectivism of the welfare type." It would be *controlled* by duly elected representatives of a people, whose distribution of income and private property would be much more equalized than is thinkable for a long time to come for the United States. It would be collectivist because of its planned *coordination* of all economic processes and its exclusion of "free enterprise" from all key economic activities. Its *goal* would be a genuine "consumers' economy" in which the size and composition of the national product would be decided upon in a thoroughly democratic way, and not by some imposed authority, however benevolent.⁶

What Will the Choices Be?

What are the chances that any of these economic alternatives will be put into practice in post-war Europe? Only a few observations can be made here. If we start from the assumption that the sole guarantee for a lasting peace in Europe is reasonably full employment and a rising standard of living, then we must eliminate from our alternatives the *status quo* type as rigorously as the *laissez-faire* type. For neither one is capable of solving the economic problems facing post-war Europe. A totalitarian regime of the German model (Type B) could create full employment all over Europe, but it is plain that the survival of fascism would be equivalent to the complete loss of the peace by the Allied Nations.

Thus, only an enlightened, though totalitarian collectivism or a genuinely democratic one, or something between them remain for our choice. Either one could operate in Europe if the regional basis were broad enough to permit it to acquire, directly or on the world market, the necessary raw material and to muster sufficient labor power and equipment. An economic federation, comprising the whole of Europe but leaving enough cultural autonomy to satisfy all reasonable national demands, would be the best solution. The next best seems to be some regional economic federations. Difficult as the political problems involved may be, they do not

seem to be insoluble, especially if it is fully understood that all future developments depend on the functioning of the economic machine. The economic process will have a by far better chance to run smoothly if raw materials, plant, equipment, and labor are not separated by customs lines. Democratic collectivism will have to overcome much more opposition than the benevolent regulation envisaged by the "young Tories." It will meet with political resistance of European vested interests; if one may draw a conclusion from the experiences after the last war and during this one, it also will encounter the distrust which most responsible groups in this country display towards any socialist experiment. On the other hand, the destruction of property and the equalization of social status, as well as the willingness to make a new start, have gone so far in Europe that some variety of democratic socialism appears to be the most welcome alternative to the war-torn, disillusioned people of the Continent.

The basic weakness of the Versailles Peace Treaty was not that it was too harsh or too lenient but that the Big Three did not bother to create possibilities of adequate employment and a tolerable income-level in the various European countries. The peace makers trusted that the economic problems would take care of themselves through the miraculous powers of the traditional *laissez-faire* system. But the system collapsed, pulling down with it all the pet schemes for permanent disarmament of Germany, the *cordon sanitaire* against Russia, and the unbridled sovereignty of the old and the newly created European states.

Very much, if not everything, depends upon the United States' understanding of this situation. Otherwise it is most likely that Europe will once more find itself in a political and economic blind alley, and will be driven once more to all kinds of extremities to escape from its unsolved problems. Political Balkanization and a return to the economic *status quo* would simply invite a repetition of the tragic events of the inter-war period. The real alternative is between creating the conditions for a strong and prosperous European "consumers' economy" and preparing the ground for a third world war.

We gratefully acknowledge the assistance of hundreds of our subscribers who were good enough to send us the total of 8,000 names of friends they regarded as prospective subscribers. We are sending sample copies to these people. This assistance is invaluable in extending the range of influence of CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS. We have been unable to acknowledge the many lists individually.

⁵ See his book *Conditions of Peace*, London and New York, 1942.

⁶ The organization of such a "consumers' economy" has been aptly described in *The Next Germany* by a group of anti-Nazi Germans, Penguin Books, N. Y., 1943.

The World Church: News and Notes

Obliteration Bombing

Dr. Oldham makes the following comment in the *Christian News-Letter* on the Bishop of Chichester's statement in the House of Lords on the question of obliteration bombing:

"The Bishop of Chichester deserves our thanks for asking the Government in a speech of great sincerity and courage in the House of Lords to make a statement about their policy in the bombing of enemy towns. The dynamic of war has so strong a tendency to engulf in its blind fury every human value that it is right that we should be made to face the question where it is carrying us. . . .

"Whether indiscriminate area bombing is indispensable as a means of bringing war production to a standstill is a question that can only be answered in the light of technical knowledge; the Government may be right that the loss of 400,000,000 man-hours of work, which the bombing of Hamburg is estimated to have cost Germany in the ensuing three months, could have been brought about in no other way.

"The deadly spiritual danger to which we are exposed does not lie in giving proper weight to these considerations, which are relevant on the military plane and may rightly determine the policy of the Government, but in being content to stop there and refusing to look beyond. The military case may be unanswerable but it is only part of the total situation. The act of destroying war production destroys at the same time much that is of the highest value, wipes out forever the unique products of man's skill and genius, scatters accumulations of books and treasures that are of benefit to the whole human race, and inflicts on human beings a vast amount of unmerited suffering, so that blows directed against the enemy pass imperceptibly into an attack on civilization and humanity itself. . . ."

"They Shall Not Perish"

Under the slogan, "They Shall Not Perish," the National Committee for the Rescue from Nazi Terror organized a meeting at Central Hall, Westminster, recently, at which the Archbishop of York was the principal speaker. Other speakers included the Chief Rabbi, Captain Quintin Hogg, Mr. Harold Nicholson, Miss Eleanor Rathbone, and Mr. Hannen Swaffer.

The following resolution was passed by the meeting:

"We have noted with deep distress the continued persecution and massacre by the Nazis of millions of victims of diverse nationalities and races. We have noted especially that Adolf Hitler is still carrying out his declared policy of exterminating the entire Jewish population in all Nazi-controlled territories. While recognizing that the final end can be put to these atrocities only by victory of the United Nations and the liberation of Europe, we ask His Majesty's government to speed up the measures of rescue for all who can be saved, and to adopt the principle that whatever other governments may do or leave undone, the British contribution to the work of rescue should be as speedy and generous as possible without delaying victory."

Orphaned Missions

The North American Councilors of the International Missionary Council, through the chairman Bishop James C. Baker and Dr. J. W. Baker, secretary, have made a statement on the problem of the "Orphaned Missions" which reads in part as follows:

"Orphaned Missions is a term born of the current world war, to denote the foreign missions of various sending countries which have been cut off from their home base lands by the hostilities. Among the most important have been the great missions of the German Churches in Tanganyika, Sumatra, India, and elsewhere. In addition, Dutch, French, Danish, Norwegian, and Finnish missions have been 'orphaned.'

"The plight of these missions has been accepted as a challenge to and a responsibility of the ecumenical Church. During the war years a sum of about \$3,000,000 has been contributed to aid them, under the sponsorship of the I.M.C. Especially noteworthy have been the contributions of the Lutheran Churches; their heroic giving has been a source of rejoicing and inspiration to all. . . .

"Orphaned Missions will call for the continuing aid well into the post-war period. The sending countries will have been ravaged, by warfare or otherwise. Their economies will be prostrate and currencies impaired, if not destroyed by inflation, reducing or obliterating any financial reserves the affected missionary societies may then hold. Church constituencies will be depleted or scattered. . . .

"Quite apart from the above difficulties, yet more serious ones may be anticipated in the case of the German Societies. After the close of World War I, it was a number of years before it proved politically possible for German missionaries to return to their former fields. After World War II this difficulty promises to be immensely greater.

"The Christian Church can never consent to regulations barring its true missionaries in peace time from any field on the sole ground of nationality. The International Missionary Council must unceasingly protest and oppose such measures. . . ."

Polish Priest Demands Germans Reopen Churches

The Polish Catholic Press Agency, KAP, reports that Father Kruszynski, vicar apostolic of the Lublin diocese in Poland, had addressed a memorandum to Dr. Wengler, the Nazi governor of Lublin, demanding that expulsions be stopped, that Nazi-closed churches be reopened and that teachers and clergy be released.

KAP reported Father Kruszynski's demands as follows:

"That expulsions, which are disorganizing the religious and cultural life of the Polish nation be stopped; that instructions be given to the authorities in Lublin district, that individual responsibility, a basic principle of all modern legislation, be strictly observed; that in accordance with human principles and international law, all women recently arrested, especially mothers of children, be released and sent back to their homes; that

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
DOROTHY CLEMENS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

all churches closed by the Germans be reopened, and all teachers released, as together with the Catholic clergy they alone by their moral influence can restore order to the devastated Lublin areas."

Father Kruszynski said that 41 Catholic churches had been closed in the district of Lublin.

Jews Raise Millions for Relief

The American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee has just issued its annual report, revealing that it has distributed \$10,453,000 during the past year for relief of Jews throughout the world. This is the largest sum raised in twenty years for this purpose. The committee has however set an even higher goal for the year 1944. It proposes to raise seventeen million during the current year.

Marine Chaplain Reports

This testimony of a Marine chaplain serving in the Pacific will be of interest to our readers, particularly because of his appreciative estimate of the significance of the chaplains' work:

"... But there was a change in all of us. It is a change that makes my work worthwhile and gives me new heart. It is the new religious attitude prompted—or rather demanded—by the combat situation. When a man is under fire, he never knocks politely at God's door—his need is too urgent. So he breaks the door down. It is at such a time that a man often finds himself half-way through a prayer that he knows not when or how he began. At such a time swearing is as often as not a kind of prayer.

"Now that things are somewhat more normal, these men want to be presented in a somewhat more polite manner to their suddenly found foxhole friend. So they are coming out to divine services as they never have before—and in a new kind of spirit. I have a strong feeling that this is not something of the moment, but will stay with them for a long, long time.

"Expressed as simply as possible, I suppose it means that these men have discovered how deep is their human need and how totally inadequate is any substitute for God as far as the answer to that need is concerned.

"To discover such a great truth about life in general and oneself in particular is too big a thing to be forgotten easily as soon as the war is over. And I have a feeling that the people back home are going to be quite surprised at the depth and maturity of the religious feeling of the returning troops—especially in those cases where no such thing existed before. . . .

"... With regard to the hate of combat, there isn't much we can do about it. Nor would we want to do anything about it, because when troops don't have it they aren't worth a tinker's damn. What you wondered about was the cold and long-cherished hate. I don't think there is much cause for concern. . . .

"A cold hatred would be expressed in combat by torturing the living enemy and mutilating his dead. I know of no cases of the former—and of very few cases of the latter (this was limited to the occasional knocking out of gold-filled teeth). There was a rather grudging admiration of the foe—principally because of his grim determination to die rather than surrender. . . ."

Communication

Professor Paul Lehmann of Wellesley College has sent us the following appreciative and pertinent comment on the Archbishop of Canterbury's statement of the task of the Christian Church in the secular world:

"It seems to me that the statement may be regarded as the first succinctly recorded sign that, on the frontier of Christian thinking at any rate, the theological controversy between the liberal movement and the dialectical theology is over. On these levels at least, polemics can be and indeed must be abandoned in favor of new and constructive avenues of Christian thought. The frank departure from the theistic pattern for the interpretation of Christian thought and the beginning with the central elements of the Christian faith as a revealed faith; the acceptance of the Atonement rather than natural right as the basis of Christian legalitarianism; the correlation of the fact of power with man's creaturely involvement in nature; and the recognition of creedal affirmations as acts, and therefore, as decisions—these all stand out in my mind as particularly creative and relevant parts of the statement. Here are, if I may borrow a phrase from another quarter of the Church's interest and activity today, pillars of an ecumenical theology which promise to be as significant, if not more so, for the present and future task of the Church, as the six propositions devoted to the peace. There are implications in these formulations which suggest and demand full discussion. . . ."

Author in This Issue:

Frederick Pollock is director of the Institute of Social Research connected with Columbia University. His article in this issue is meant to give some directives to our thought in the difficult area of economic reconstruction. This area of post-war problems is frequently neglected in the rather too political plans of reconstruction.

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.

Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-45